

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-7 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 3-7 are amended. Claim 2 is canceled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter therein. The subject matter of claim 2 is incorporated into claims 1 and 3-5.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Poon at the interview held June 14, 2005, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

On pages 2-6, the Office Action rejects claims 1 and 3-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,742,408 to Funada et al. (hereinafter "Funada"). On page 6, the Office Action rejects claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Funada in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,857,709 to Chock. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

On page 6, the Office Action concedes that Funada does not disclose, teach or suggest the subject matter recited in claim 2. In order to overcome this admitted deficiency in Funada, the Office Action relies on Chock. Specifically, the Office Action relies on the hologram disclosed in Chock. The Office Action refers to this hologram as a "printed hologram." The Office Action also refers to "the latent image printing taught by Chock." However, as discussed at the June 14 personal interview and stated in the Interview Summary, Chock does not disclose that the hologram is printed. Rather, Chock expressly discloses that the hologram is not printed. See column 4, line 39 to column 5, line 32 (especially column 4, lines 41-44.) The only printing disclosed by Chock is an embodiment where the top surface of the hologram is printed. See column 4, lines 41-44, column 5, lines 28-31.

Claims 1 and 3-5 are amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 2. Claims 1 and 3-7 are amended to recite that the image is formed by printing.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the subject matter recited in claims 1 and 3-7 is not disclosed, taught or suggested by Funada or Chock.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the prior art rejections on pages 2-6 of the Office Action be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claim 1 and 3-7 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Mark R. Woodall
Registration No. 43,286

JAO:MRW/tls

Date: June 20, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

| |
|--|
| <p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p> |
|--|